

**SUPREME COURT MINUTES
FRIDAY, MARCH 12, 2004
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA**

S116311

CHISOM (J. O.) ON H.C.
Petition ordered withdrawn

S008112

PEOPLE v. HALVORSEN (ARTHUR)
Extension of time granted

to May 11, 2004 to file appellant's reply brief. The court anticipates that after that date, only one further extension totaling 30 additional days will be granted. Counsel is ordered to inform his or her attorney or entity, if any, and any assisting attorney or entity of any separate counsel of record, of this schedule, and to take all steps necessary to meet it.

S012279

PEOPLE v. LUCAS (DAVID A.)
Extension of time granted

to May 14, 2004 to file respondent's brief. After that date, only four further extensions totaling about 240 additional days will be granted. Extension is granted based upon Supervising Deputy Attorney General's William M. Wood's representation that he anticipates filing that brief by 1/15/2005.

S018637

PEOPLE v. HOVARTER (JACKIE RAY)
Extension of time granted

to May 7, 2004 to file appellant's reply brief. After that date, only two further extensions totaling about 115 additional days will be granted. Extension is granted based upon Assistant State Public Defender Denise Kendall's representation that she anticipates filing that brief by 8/31/2004.

S031603PEOPLE v. LEWIS (JOHN I.)
Extension of time granted

to May 14, 2004 to file appellant's reply brief. After that date, only four further extensions totaling about 195 additional days will be granted. Extension is granted based upon Assistant State Public Defender Kathleen M. Scheidel's representation that she anticipates filing that brief by 12/2004.

S041008PEOPLE v. JAIME ARMANDO HOYOS
Extension of time granted

to May 17, 2004 to file respondent's brief. After that date, only two further extensions totaling about 90 additional days will be granted. Extension is granted based upon Deputy Attorney General Anthony Da Silva's representation that he anticipates filing that brief by 8/17/2004.

S042224PEOPLE v. CRUZ (THOMAS V.)
Extension of time granted

to May 3, 2004 to file appellant's opening brief. Extension is granted based upon counsel Lisa Short's representation that she anticipates filing that brief by 5/3/2004. After that date, no further extension will be granted.

S048337PEOPLE v. THOMAS (REGIS D.)
Extension of time granted

to May 11, 2004 to file appellant's opening brief. After that date, only two further extensions totaling about 120 additional days will be granted. Extension is granted based upon Deputy State Public Defender Mary K. McComb's representation that she anticipates filing that brief by 9/15/2004.

S049973

PEOPLE v. KELLY (DOUGLAS OLIVER)

Extension of time granted

to May 7, 2004 to file appellant's opening brief. The court anticipates that after that date, no further extension will be granted. Counsel is ordered to inform his or her supervising attorney, if any, of this schedule, and to take all steps necessary to meet it.

S051451

PEOPLE v. VALENCIA (ALFREDO)

Extension of time granted

to May 11, 2004 to file appellant's opening brief. After that date, only two further extensions totaling about 120 additional days will be granted. Extension is granted based upon Deputy State Public Defender Jamilla Moore's representation that she anticipates filing that brief by 9/2004.

S055474

PEOPLE v. PERRY (CLIFTON)

Extension of time granted

to April 15, 2004 to file appellant's opening brief. After that date, no further extensions will be granted. Extension is granted based upon Deputy State Public Defender Ronald Turner's representation that he anticipates filing that brief by 4/15/2004.

S055501

PEOPLE v. BUTLER (RAYMOND O.)

Extension of time granted

to May 11, 2004 to file appellant's opening brief. The court anticipates that after that date, only two further extensions totaling about 120 additional days will be granted. Counsel is ordered to inform his or her supervising attorney, if any, of this schedule, and to take all steps necessary to meet it.

S055652

PEOPLE v. FREDDIE FUIAVA
Extension of time granted

to June 1, 2004 to file the reply brief. Extension is granted based upon counsel Michael Sattris's representation that he anticipates filing that brief by 6/30/2004. After that date, only one further extension totaling about 30 days is contemplated.

S056842

PEOPLE v. RICCARDI (JOHN A.)
Extension of time granted

to May 7, 2004 to file the respondent's brief. After that date, only one further extension totaling about 30 additional days will be granted. Extension is granted based upon Deputy Attorney General Michael W. Whitaker's representation that he anticipates filing that brief by 6/9/2004.

S060803

PEOPLE v. MUNGIA (JOHN)
Extension of time granted

to May 11, 2004 to file appellant's opening brief. After that date, only one further extension totaling about 30 additional days will be granted. Extension is granted based upon Supervising Deputy State Public Defender Jeffrey J. Gales's representation that he anticipates filing that brief by 6/10/2004.

S065467

PEOPLE v. MENDOZA (RONALD)
Extension of time granted

to April 27, 2004 to file appellant's opening brief. The court anticipates that after that date, only four further extensions totaling about 240 additional days will be granted. Counsel is ordered to inform his or her supervising attorney, if any, of this schedule, and to take all steps necessary to meet it.

S066939

PEOPLE v. ALLEN & JOHNSON

Extension of time granted

to May 3, 2004 to file appellant Michael Allen's opening brief. After that date, no further extension will be granted. Extension is granted based upon counsel Brent F. Romney's representation that based upon counsel Brent F. Romney's representation that he anticipates filing that brief by 5/1/2004.

S067394

PEOPLE v. CAPISTRANO (JOHN I.)

Extension of time granted

to May 11, 2004 to file appellant's opening brief. The court anticipates that after that date, only one further extensions totaling about 60 additional days will be granted. Counsel is ordered to inform his or her supervising attorney, if any, of this schedule, and to take all steps necessary to meet it.

S068536

PEOPLE v. MCWHORTER (RICHARD)

Extension of time granted

to May 11, 2004 to file appellant's opening brief. The court anticipates that after that date, only two further extensions totaling about 120 additional days will be granted. Counsel is ordered to inform his or her supervising attorney, if any, of this schedule, and to take all steps necessary to meet it.

S089623

PEOPLE v. WILSON (LESTER)

Extension of time granted

to May 3, 2004 to file appellant's opening brief. After that date, only one further extension totaling about 40 additional days will be granted. Extension is granted based upon counsel Patrick Morgan Ford's representation that he anticipates filing that brief by 6/10/2004.

S110741PADILLA (ALFREDO A.) ON H.C.
Extension of time granted

to April 9, 2004 to file the reply to the informal response to the petition for writ of habeas corpus. Extension is granted based upon Assistant Federal Defender Joe Schlesinger's representation that he anticipates filing that document by 4/9/2004. After that date, no further extension will be granted.

S114732BRISCOE (KHYLE A.) ON H.C.
Extension of time granted

On application of petitioner and good cause appearing, it is hereby ordered that the time to serve and file Petitioner's Reply to the Attorney General's Informal Response is hereby extended to and including April 13, 2004.

S116554AVILA (JOHNNY) ON H.C.
Extension of time granted

to April 9, 2004 to file the informal response to the petition for writ of habeas corpus. The court anticipates that after that date, only one further extension totaling about 30 additional days will be granted.

S116605NAKAHARA (EVAN T.) ON H.C.
Extension of time granted

to April 16, 2004 to file the reply to the informal response to the petition for writ of habeas corpus. The court anticipates that after that date, only three further extensions totaling about 90 additional days will be granted. Counsel is ordered to inform his or her supervising attorney, if any, of this schedule, and to take all steps necessary to meet it.

S116750DAVIS (STANLEY B.) ON H.C.
Extension of time granted

to April 12, 2004 to file the reply to the informal response to the petition for writ of habeas corpus. After that date, no further extension is contemplated. Extension is granted based upon Deputy State Public Defender Debra S. Sabah Press's representation that she anticipates filing that brief by 4/10/2004.

S117268HOLLOWAY (DUANE) ON H.C.
Extension of time granted

to April 7, 2004 to file the reply to the informal response to the petition for writ of habeas corpus. After that date, no further extension will be granted. Extension is granted based upon counsel Mark D. Greenberg's representation that he anticipates filing that document by 4/17/2004.

S117641G029525 Fourth Appellate District,
G029607 Division ThreePEOPLE v. BRICENO
Extension of time granted

Appellant's time to serve and file the response to amicus curiae brief is extended to and including March 19, 2004.

S120084MILLWEE (DONALD R.) ON H.C.
Extension of time granted

to April 5, 2004 to file the informal response to the petition for writ of habeas corpus. Extension is granted based upon Deputy Attorney General Susan Elizabeth Miller's representation that she anticipates filing that document by 4/3/2004. After that date, no further extension is contemplated.

S120253**BROWN (JOHN G.) ON H.C.**
Extension of time granted

to 4/1/2004 to file the informal response to the petition for writ of habeas corpus. After that date, no further extension will be granted. Extension is granted based upon Supervising Deputy Attorney General Robert M. Foster's representation that he anticipates filing that document by 3/31/2004.

S121004**DANKS (JOSEPH M.) ON H.C.**
Extension of time granted

to April 9, 2004 to file the informal response to the petition for writ of habeas corpus. Extension is granted based upon Deputy Attorney General Lloyd G. Carter's representation that he anticipates filing that document by 6/2/2004. After that date, only two further extensions totaling about 60 additional days will be granted.

S121184**OCHOA (SERGIO) ON H.C.**
Extension of time granted

to April 12, 2004 to file the informal response to the petition for writ of habeas corpus. Extension is granted based upon Deputy Attorney General Brad D. Levenson's representation that he anticipates filing that document by 5/11/2004. After that date, only one further extension totaling about 30 additional days is contemplated.

S121187**WILLIAMS (DAVID EARL) ON H.C.**
Extension of time granted

to April 19, 2004 to file the informal response to the petition for writ of habeas corpus. After that date, only four further extensions totaling about 120 additional days will be granted. Extension is granted based upon Deputy Attorney General Suzann E. Papagoda's representation that she anticipates filing that document by 8/15/2004.

S121789STATEN (DEONDRE ARTHUR) ON H.C.
Extension of time granted

to April 9, 2004 to file the informal response to the petition for writ of habeas corpus. After that date, only one further extension totaling 30 additional days will be granted. Extension is granted based upon Deputy Attorney General Scott A. Taryle's representation that he anticipates filing that document by 5/9/2004.

S122545OLIVER (ANTHONY C.) ON H.C.
Extension of time granted

to April 14, 2004 to file the informal response to the petition for writ of habeas corpus. After that date, only two further extensions totaling 60 additional days will be granted. Extension is granted based upon Deputy Attorney General Alan D. Tate's representation that he anticipates filing that document by 6/2004.

S122865LEWIS v. ALFARO
Request denied

The motion for leave to intervene, filed by Del Martin et al. on March 1, 2004, is denied without prejudice to filing an application to appear as amicus curiae pursuant to the procedure set forth in the order filed in this matter on March 11, 2004.

Petitioners' motion to file a supplemental brief, filed on March 5, 2004, is denied.

S122923LOCKYER v. CITY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Request denied

The motion for leave to intervene, filed by Del Martin et al. on March 1, 2004, is denied without prejudice to filing an application to appear as amicus curiae pursuant to the procedure set forth in the order filed in this matter on March 11, 2004.

The motion for leave to intervene, filed by Randy Thomasson and Campaign for California

Families on March 2, 2004, is denied without prejudice to filing an application to appear as amicus curiae pursuant to the procedure set forth in the order filed in this matter on March 11, 2004.

The motion for leave to intervene, filed by Anthony Bernan et al. on March 5, 2004, is denied without prejudice to filing an application to appear as amicus curiae pursuant to the procedure set forth in the order filed in this matter on March 11, 2004.

S121225

MERRYMAN ON DISCIPLINE

Recommended discipline imposed

It is ordered that **LAWRENCE A. MERRYMAN, State Bar No. 28984**, be suspended from the practice of law for one year, that execution of suspension be stayed, and that he be placed on probation for one year on condition that he be actually suspended for 90 days. The period of probation must be consecutive to the period of probation ordered in S106726. Respondent is also ordered to comply with the other conditions of probation recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its order approving stipulation filed October 23, 2003. It is further ordered that he take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination within one year after the effective date of this order. (See *Segretti v. State Bar* (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) Costs are awarded to the State Bar pursuant to Business & Professions Code section 6086.10 and payable in equal installments for membership years 2005, 2006, 2007 and 2008.

S121229

PARWATIKAR ON DISCIPLINE

Recommended discipline imposed

It is ordered that **DEEPAK SADASHIV PARWATIKAR, State Bar No. 187683**, be suspended from the practice of law for three years, that execution of the suspension be stayed, and that he be placed on probation for

three years subject to the conditions of probation, including one year actual suspension, recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its Order Approving Stipulation filed on October 28, 2003. It is also ordered that he take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination within one year after the effective date of this order. (See *Segretti v. State Bar* (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) It is further ordered that he comply with rule 955 of the California Rules of Court, and that he perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 30 and 40 calendar days, respectively, after the effective date of this order.* Costs are awarded to the State Bar in accordance with Business & Professions Code section 6086.10 and payable in accordance with Business & Professions Code section 6140.7.
*(See Bus. & Prof. Code, § 6126, subd. (c).)

S121233

CLARKE ON DISCIPLINE
Recommended discipline imposed

It is ordered that **ROBERT F. CLARKE, State Bar No. 79881**, be suspended from the practice of law for three years and until he has shown proof satisfactory to the State Bar Court of his rehabilitation, fitness to practice and learning and ability in the general law pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii) of the Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct, that execution of the suspension be stayed, and that he be placed on probation for three years on condition that he be actually suspended for 18 months. **Robert F. Clarke** is further ordered to comply with the other conditions of probation recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its Order Approving Stipulation filed on October 29, 2003. It is also ordered that **Robert F. Clarke** take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination during the period of his actual suspension. (See *Segretti v. State Bar* (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) **Robert F. Clarke** is further ordered to comply with rule 955 of the California Rules of Court, and perform the acts

specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 30 and 40 calendar days, respectively, after the effective date of this order.* Costs are awarded to the State Bar in accordance with Business & Professions Code section 6086.10 and payable in accordance with Business & Professions Code section 6140.7.

*(See Bus. & Prof. Code, § 6126, subd. (c).)

S121235

YOUNT ON DISCIPLINE

Recommended discipline imposed

It is ordered that **STEVEN RAY YOUNT, State Bar No. 141671**, be suspended from the practice of law for two years and until he provides proof satisfactory to the State Bar Court of his rehabilitation, fitness to practice and present learning and ability in the general law pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii), Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct, that execution of suspension be stayed, and that he be placed on probation for three years on condition that he be actually suspended for 60 days. Respondent is also ordered to comply with the other conditions of probation recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its order approving stipulation filed September 25, 2003, as modified by its order filed on November 17, 2003. Credit toward the period of actual suspension must be given for the period of interim suspension which commenced on May 10, 2003. It is further ordered that he take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination within one year after the effective date of this order. (See *Segretti v. State Bar* (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) Costs are awarded to the State Bar pursuant to Business & Professions Code section 6086.10 and payable in equal installments for membership years 2005 and 2006.

S121237

TANNER ON DISCIPLINE
Recommended discipline imposed

It is ordered that **MARTIN STANLEY TANNER, State Bar No. 129114**, be suspended from the practice of law for three years and until he has shown proof satisfactory to the State Bar Court of his rehabilitation, fitness to practice and learning and ability in the general law pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii), Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct, that execution of the suspension be stayed, and that he be placed on probation for four years on condition that he be actually suspended for one year. Respondent is further ordered to comply with the other conditions of probation recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its order approving stipulation filed on October 10, 2003, as modified by its order filed November 12, 2003. It is also ordered that respondent take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination during the period of his actual suspension. (See *Segretti v. State Bar* (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) Respondent is further ordered to comply with rule 955 of the California Rules of Court, and perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 30 and 40 calendar days, respectively, after the effective date of this order.* Costs are awarded to the State Bar and one-half of said costs must be added to and become part of the membership fees for the years 2005 and 2006. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 6086.10.)
*(See Bus. & Prof. Code, § 6126, subd. (c).)

S121456

CHANG ON DISCIPLINE
Recommended discipline imposed

It is ordered that **MEREDITH M. CHANG, State Bar No. 148986**, be suspended from the practice of law for two years and until he pays the fine specified in the stipulation, that execution of the suspension be stayed, and that respondent be placed on probation for two years subject to the conditions of probation, including actual suspension of 150 days and

until he pays the fine of \$500 as specified in the stipulation and furnishes satisfactory proof thereof to the State Bar's Office of Probation in Los Angeles, as recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its order approving stipulation filed October 15, 2003, as modified. If respondent is actually suspended for two years or more, he must remain actually suspended until he provides proof to the satisfaction of the State Bar Court of his rehabilitation, fitness to practice and learning and ability in the general law pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii) of the Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct. It is further ordered that respondent take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination within one year after the effective date of this order or during the period of his actual suspension, whichever is longer. (See *Segretti v. State Bar* (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) It is further ordered that respondent comply with rule 955 of the California Rules of Court, and that he perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 30 and 40 days, respectively, after the effective date of this order.* Costs are awarded to the State Bar and one-half of said costs must be added to and become part of the membership fees for years 2005 and 2006. (Bus. & Prof. Code section 6086.10.)

*(See Bus. & Prof. Code, § 6126, subd. (c).)

S121458

HOLZINGER ON DISCIPLINE
Recommended discipline imposed

It is ordered that **ROBERT E. HOLZINGER, State Bar No. 200278**, be suspended from the practice of law for two years and until he has shown proof satisfactory to the State Bar Court of his rehabilitation, fitness to practice and learning and ability in the general law pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii) of the Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct, that execution of the suspension be stayed, and that he be placed on probation for three years subject to the conditions of probation, including six months actual suspension, recommended by

the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its Order Approving Stipulation filed on November 3, 2003. It is also ordered that he take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination within one year after the effective date of this order. (See *Segretti v. State Bar* (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) It is further ordered that he comply with rule 955 of the California Rules of Court, and that he perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 30 and 40 calendar days, respectively, after the effective date of this order.* Costs are awarded to the State Bar in accordance with Business & Professions Code section 6086.10 and payable in accordance with Business & Professions Code section 6140.7. *(See Bus. & Prof. Code, § 6126, subd. (c).)

S121460

LONG ON DISICIPLINE
Recommended discipline imposed

It is ordered that **ROBERT KEITH LONG, State Bar No. 103344**, be suspended from the practice of law for two years, that execution of the suspension be stayed, and that he be actually suspended from the practice of law for one year and until he makes restitution to Suzanne Kempik (or the Client Security Fund, if appropriate) in the amount of \$12,500 plus 10% interest per annum from March 19, 2001, and furnishes satisfactory proof thereof to the State Bar's Office of Probation in Los Angeles, as recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its decision filed on October 17, 2003; and until the State Bar Court grants a motion to terminate his actual suspension pursuant to rule 205 of the Rules of Procedure of the State Bar of California. Respondent is also ordered to comply with the conditions of probation, if any, hereinafter imposed by the State Bar Court as a condition for terminating his actual suspension. If respondent is actually suspended for two years or more, he shall remain actually suspended until he provides proof to the satisfaction of the State Bar Court of his rehabilitation, fitness to practice and

learning and ability in the general law pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii) of the Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct. It is further ordered that respondent take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination within one year after the effective date of this order or during the period of his actual suspension, whichever is longer. (See *Segretti v. State Bar* (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) It is further ordered that respondent comply with rule 955 of the California Rules of Court, and that he perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 30 and 40 days, respectively, after the effective date of this order.* Costs are awarded to the State Bar in accordance with Business & Professions Code section 6086.10 and payable in accordance with Business & Professions Code section 6140.7.

*(See Bus. & Prof. Code, § 6126, subd. (c).)

S121461

TARKANIAN ON DISCIPLINE
Recommended discipline imposed

It is ordered that **WILLIAM VAHAN TARKANIAN, State Bar No. 144491**, be suspended from the practice of law for one year, that execution of the suspension be stayed, and that he be actually suspended from the practice of law for 30 days and until the State Bar Court grants a motion to terminate his actual suspension pursuant to rule 205 of the Rules of Procedure of the State Bar of California, as recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its decision filed August 1, 2003, as modified by its order filed October 22, 2003. **William Vahan Tarkanian** is also ordered to comply with the conditions of probation, if any, hereinafter imposed by the State Bar Court as a condition for terminating his actual suspension. If **William Vahan Tarkanian** is actually suspended for two years or more, he must remain actually suspended until he provides proof to the satisfaction of the State Bar Court of his rehabilitation, fitness to practice and learning and ability in the general law pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii) of the

Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct. It is further ordered that **William Vahan Tarkanian** take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination within one year after the effective date of this order or during the period of his actual suspension, whichever is longer. (See *Segretti v. State Bar* (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) If **William Vahan Tarkanian** is actually suspended for 90 days or more, it is further ordered that he comply with rule 955 of the California Rules of Court, and that he perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 120 and 130 days, respectively, after the date this order is effective.* Costs are awarded to the State Bar in accordance with Business & Professions Code section 6086.10 and payable in accordance with Business & Professions Code section 6140.7.
*(See Bus. & Prof. Code, § 6126, subd. (c).)

S121462

WHITLEY ON DISCIPLINE
Recommended discipline imposed

It is ordered that **JACK A. WHITLEY, State Bar No. 75200**, be suspended from the practice of law for two years and until he has shown proof satisfactory to the State Bar Court of his rehabilitation, fitness to practice and learning and ability in the general law pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii), Standards for Attorney Sanctions, that execution of the suspension be stayed, and that he be placed on probation for three years subject to the conditions of probation recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its order approving stipulation filed on October 29, 2003. It is further ordered that he take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination within one year after the effective date of this order. (See *Segretti v. State Bar* (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) Costs are awarded to the State Bar and one-half of said costs must be added to and become part of the membership fees for years 2005 and 2006. (Bus. & Prof. Code section 6086.10.)

S121464

SARRO ON DISCIPLINE

Recommended discipline imposed

It is ordered that **FRANK SARRO, State Bar No. 129780**, be suspended from the practice of law for one year, that execution of the suspension be stayed, and that he be placed on probation for two years subject to the conditions of probation recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its order approving stipulation filed on October 23, 2003, as modified. It is further ordered that he take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination within one year after the effective date of this order. (See *Segretti v. State Bar* (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) Costs are awarded to the State Bar in accordance with Business & Professions Code section 6086.10 and payable in accordance with Business & Professions Code section 6140.7.

S121466

JANZEN ON DISCIPLINE

Recommended discipline imposed

It is ordered that **CAROLYN S. JANZEN, State Bar No. 102998**, be suspended from the practice of law for one year, that execution of the suspension be stayed, and that she be placed on probation for two years subject to the conditions of probation recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its order approving stipulation filed on October 29, 2003, as modified by its order filed on December 22, 2003. It is further ordered that she take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination within one year after the effective date of this order. (See *Segretti v. State Bar* (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) Costs are awarded to the State Bar pursuant to Business & Professions Code section 6086.10 and payable in equal installments for membership years 2005, 2006 and 2007.

Bar Misc. 4186

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF THE
COMMITTEE OF BAR EXAMINERS OF THE
STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA FOR ADMISSION
OF ATTORNEYS

The written motion of the Committee of Bar
Examiners that the following named
applicants, who have fulfilled the
requirements for admission to practice law
in the State of California, be admitted to the
practice of law in this state is hereby
granted, with permission to the applicants to
take the oath before a competent officer at
another time and place:
(LIST OF NAMES ATTACHED TO
ORIGINAL ORDER)

B150223 Second Appellate District

CITY OF SANTA MONICA v. MARIA STEWART

The above-entitled matter, now pending in the
Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, is
transferred from Division One to Division Eight.

B162945 Second Appellate District

CAMILLA NUNEZ v. RAPHAEL DE LOS RIOS

The above-entitled matter, now pending in the
Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, is
transferred from Division Eight to Division One.

H024695 Sixth Appellate District

PEOPLE v. LOUIS IVESTER PEETS

The time for granting review on the court's own
motion is hereby extended to and including
April 14, 2004. (Cal. Rules of Court,
rule 28.2(c).)